

REPORT OF SITE FINDINGS

Capella University

June 24-28, 2007

Review Team Members

Carolyn Dumler, chairperson, K-12 Administration

Diane Abel, Community Colleges

Patty Hardy, Arizona Department of Education

Kathy Bohan, State Institution of Higher Education

Lisa Kelley, National Board Certified Teacher

Nicole Stasinski, Arizona Education Association

Elena Parra, Private Institution of Higher Education



Arizona Department of Education

1535 W. Jefferson

Phoenix, AZ 85007

INTRODUCTION

Arizona State Board rule R7-2-604(A) states: The Board shall evaluate and may approve the professional preparation programs which request Board Approval. Rules R7-2-604 and R7-2-604.01 apply to all professional preparation programs in teacher, administrator, school guidance counselor, and school psychology programs that lead to certification. The Board may grant approval for a period not to exceed five years. A copy of Board rules governing the Professional Preparation Approval Process is attached to this document.

The professional preparation program review for Capella University was conducted on June 24-28, 2007. Programs reviewed were the Master of Science in Education, Specialization in Leadership in Education Administration and the Doctor of Philosophy in Education, Specialization in Leadership in Educational Administration. A seven-member review team conducted the site visit in Phoenix, while two review team members traveled to Minneapolis, Minnesota to complete the program review.

The review team expresses its appreciation to the faculty for their work in preparation for the visit. The faculty and staff were very cooperative with the team throughout the visit. The team further expresses appreciation for the hospitality shown them on the site visit in both Scottsdale, Arizona and Minneapolis, Minnesota.

The Arizona State Board of Education and the Arizona Department of Education regard the approval process as a collaborative endeavor to maintain, improve, and ensure educator preparation quality in Arizona. The on-site visits are an important part of that process. Because information was provided in the on-site visit that had not been previously submitted, Capella was asked to submit an addendum containing that documentation by July 6, 2007 in order to complete the review process. Following are the findings of the review team along with the list of exhibits and interviews used for reaching the conclusions.

PROFESSIONAL COMMENTS AND OBSERVATIONS (COMMON THREADS)

Commendations:

- There are frequent interactions with faculty and intern peers in the online course room during the internship.
- Internship proposals include peer review.
- Each site supervisor receives a supporting text to aid in the supervision of the interns.
- There is interaction among a diverse group of learners within the cohort.
- The proposal created by the intern during the internship is supported and monitored by the supervisor and a faculty member.
- The faculty professional development is a high point especially with the creation of the online community.
- The scholar-practioner model encourages faculty to remain active in their field and enhance professional experiences.
- Learners and alumni express tremendous satisfaction with the programs in educational administration.
- Building relationships is a key to customer satisfaction and student success; persistence to completion is important.
- The colloquia and residencies allow for face-to-face interactions, benefit learners, and provide observation of skills demonstration.
- Class size cap of 23, with many classes even smaller, is commendable.
- There is a strong course development process, including content expert, faculty review, ongoing review process, responsiveness to market changes/needs.
- Capella provides frequent communication to learners at all stages in the program(s).

PROGRAM REPORT

Program Name: Masters of Science in Psychology-Specialization in School Psychology and Specialist Certificate in School Psychology

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The school psychology specialization prepares learners to be an advocate for school-age children and adolescents, stressing respect for individual differences, collaborative problem solving, and empirically-based interventions. Upon graduation, learners are prepared to apply a systems-based approach to address the social, emotional, academic, behavioral, and cognitive well-being of students. Graduates of this program are typically employed by public school districts, but may also seek employment with community agencies, in specialized school settings, or in education cooperatives. Learners interested in applying for state licensure or national certification as a school psychologist will need to enroll in both the master's degree specialization and the specialist certificate in school psychology.

Program/Course sequence

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Meets certification requirements

Met ☒ Unmet ☐ See comments below.

Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

Capella clarified with the Review Team that the intent of the program review was to approve the Masters of Science in Psychology-Specialization in School Psychology and the Specialist Certificate in School Psychology programs together as one "total package." This combination reflects the requirements for Arizona School Psychology certification with coursework and internship expectations. The program course sequence includes a master's in school psychology combined with a certification program in school psychology. Students are required to complete a Masters program in school psychology and submit an application for admission to the certification program in school psychology. Only Capella students are eligible to apply for the certification program. Nine transfer credits are allowed.

According to administration, faculty and students, students move "seamlessly" from one program to the other. Candidates must complete both components of the program to qualify for Arizona School Psychology certification.

Course prerequisites are clearly identified.

Coursework is scaffold.

"Year-in-Residence" experiences are closely aligned to coursework providing appropriate theoretical basis to hands-on-experiences.

Students are in cohorts, building on relationships and skills among classmates.

Program is not an online only program, but provides extended weekend and week-in-residencies to develop skills and ensure competencies.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Course sequence
- Faculty interviews
- Learner interviews
- Home page on website

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable.
Alignment to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> See comments below.
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> See comments below.
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> See comments below.

Findings of the Team:

Course information in notebooks and online appeared complete.

There was a lack of alignment between competencies, NASP standards, and assessment outcomes for learners. Newer syllabi revisions better reflect the need for alignment and evidence of outcomes.

The current Alignment Map to NASP Domains identified only the course number and standard.

Objectives and competencies were not clearly stated and were not measurable.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Staff needs to review syllabi to ensure that objectives and competencies are measurable.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Interviews with faculty and students

If Unmet, further action required:

Align course competencies to the NASP standards and domains.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised documents.

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

It was unclear as to exactly which assignments were benchmark/signature assignments. Several syllabi listed Options A, B, or C. The various options did not always appear to be equally rigorous.

What “appeared” to be benchmark assignments capture the content and application of a good range of competencies critical to the profession.

Courses integrate multiple domain and competences across the Masters and certification programs.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program Matrix
- Interviews with faculty and learners during the Phoenix site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Identify benchmark assignments and clearly indicate in syllabi and program matrix.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised documents.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Clearly identified criteria

Met ☐

Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Rubrics provided for discussions, project requirements or case studies in course and syllabi are not consistent throughout the program. Some were checklists, while others were very inclusive.

Consistency with levels of performance and criteria needed. For example, levels on rubrics ranged from 0 to 3, 1 to 4, or 1 to 7. A consistent range is needed. Anchor statements need to be clearly stated and objective.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Identify benchmark assignments in the portfolio. The graded rubric should accompany the assignment in the portfolio.

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Student work samples

If Unmet, further action required:

Review and develop rubrics with clearly identified criteria that are consistent for all benchmark assignments.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised documents.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team

Learners are required to complete Practicum I and Practicum II (350 clock hours).

Internship I, Internship II, and Internship III require 1200 clock hours with appropriate supervision (1 credit hour /20 clock hours).

Requirements and supporting documentation are well developed. Documentation of hours, forms, and supervision ratings were extensive.

Faculty report frequent contact with site supervisors and learners express support from university faculty. Site supervisors report that learners are well prepared entering their fieldwork experience.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Syllabi
- Program matrix
- Interviews with learners, faculty and site supervisors during the Phoenix site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

Benchmark assignments in field experiences need to be clearly identified in syllabi and matrix.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised documents.

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE (PRACTICUM AND INTERNSHIP)

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	NA
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

The Site Supervisor's Evaluation (Form Q) appears to be aligned to APA, but could be better aligned to NASP standards.

Documentation forms thoroughly collect information on activities, hours, and supervision. Some evidence of NASP Standards is embedded in the evaluation.

Online Tutorial and Manual information provide support to learner's on how to complete forms.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Online Tutorial and Manual
- Psychology Forms G, H, I
- Fieldwork Forms M, N, O, P, Q, R and a Self-Assessment Summary

If Unmet, further action required:

Align Site Supervisor Evaluation(s) with NASP Standards and Domains.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised documents.

INTERNSHIP

Requirements are clearly identified

Met ☒ Unmet ☐ NA

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The School Psychology Field Training Manual was extensive. The manual clearly covered requirements and provided forms for documentation. The online forms also assist interns with documenting their experience.

The internship requires 1200 clock hours with supervision by a certified school psychologist. University site supervisors provide regular contacts with internship site supervisors and interns.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that program coursework assessments, **field experiences and capstone experiences** align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- School Psychology Field Training Manual
- Interviews with site supervisors and students

If Unmet, further action required:

Align identified competencies, benchmark assignments and outcome data.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised documents.

PROGRAM MATRIX

Findings of the Team:

The Program Matrix restated the competencies rather than providing specific evidence to demonstrate candidate's competency in meeting the standards. Artifacts and evidence were not stated on matrix.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Matrix
- Syllabi

If Unmet, further action required:

Program Matrix needs to be re-submitted with artifacts and outcome evidence clearly stated.

See program approval timelines for submission of revised matrix.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Assessment data were not available to the review team.

Faculty recognizes that objectives and competencies need alignment and have been making revisions.

In interviews, faculty stated the need to improve assessments. Faculty recognizes the need for greater supervision of assessment courses. Faculty indicated the institution had purchased video equipment and are considering alternative approaches for monitoring candidate's assessment skills.

Outcome data are collected, but need to be aligned with standards.

Faculty are aware of the need to have at least three years of outcome data, and currently use data to revise syllabi, objectives, and learner expectations.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Interviews with faculty and administration
- Program Matrix

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit assessment plan to ADE within 30 days of State Board approval.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ ***Two (2) Year Approval***

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution needs to submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency;
- Updated Program Matrix that provides evidence of how National Standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experiences and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidate's competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessments identified in the Program Matrix.

PROGRAM OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS

Strengths:

- Strong application for field placements requesting specific, comprehensive information from the district.
- Learners stated they are very satisfied with the program of study, faculty, and university support.
- Supervisors view learners as being prepared and skillful.
- Site supervisors and employers describe learners as motivated and enthusiastic.
- Step 1 and Step 2 program submissions were well organized.
- Faculty is knowledgeable and integrates expertise into coursework.
- Learners are required to know the state policies, regulations, and standards for the state in which they intend to practice.
- Learners develop relationships with individuals from a national audience from diverse backgrounds and professional experiences.
- Training program is addressing an area of need that has been neglected. Specifically, the African American learners as school psychologists.
- Faculty indicates a desire to continue to develop online platforms for coursework, as well as on online portfolio.

Concerns:

- Evaluation of candidate's skills in administering required assessments.
- Fieldwork supervisors indicate that learners have basic assessment skills; learners indicate needing exposure to additional assessments. Additionally, the reviewers have concerns about learners needing more in depth skill development with interpretation and link to intervention/recommendations.
- Increase cultural diversity training to create depth of understanding for learners and to assist learners in integrating cultural awareness with practical application.
- Difficulty maintaining the integrity of the program with limited core faculty (NASP recommends 1:10 ratio).
- Prioritization of program development and accreditation (e.g., NASP, NCATE, APA, Vista, online portfolio, etc).
- Review team recommends Capella pursue NASP accreditation.

PROGRAM REVIEW

Program Name: Educational Leadership and Administration; MS, PhD

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION:

The Educational Leadership and Administration, MS and PhD programs are designed for licensed teachers with at least three years of classroom experience who wish to move into administrative roles. These programs prepare individuals to assume vital roles in schools, districts, and other organizations serving children and adolescents. The competency-based program is aligned to nationally recognized external standards and is designed to provide learners with the practical skills necessary to be successful administrators in today's diverse schools.

Program/Course sequence	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Meets certification requirements	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Unique coursework (no omnibus numbers)	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The program scope and sequence provided detailed correlation between ISLLC standards, university outcomes, and specialization outcomes. Within the outcomes for the specialization area of Educational Leadership, competencies were further delineated by principal and superintendent outcomes.

Capella identifies twenty-one specific outcomes for principals and eight additional outcomes for superintendents.

In the courses reviewed by the review team, there were more competencies that indicated indirect alignment than direct alignment.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (A): At a minimum, the professional preparation program shall include training in the standards described in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603, a capstone experience, and **alignment with national standards**.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the **program course sequence**, descriptions of all required courses, and **verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement**.

R7-2-614 (B); (C); (D): **Three years of verified teaching experience** in grades Prekindergarten-12 (administrator certification only).

Recommendation(s):

Clarification and strengthening of the delineation between direct and indirect alignment is recommended.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Documents
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

COURSE INFORMATION

All syllabi provided	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Course description	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Alignment to Arizona Professional Teaching Standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/> N/A
Alignment to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Topics/objectives clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>
Competencies clearly identified	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>

Findings of the Team:

The team applauds the emphasis on curriculum/instruction/student achievement, as evidenced by the following courses: ED5501 Assessment and Improvement of Instruction; ED5500 Standards-Based Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment; and ED5504 Strategies for Eliminating the Achievement Gap. Additionally, Capella differentiates the principalship course by offering ED853 Elementary School Administration or ED854 Secondary School Administration, thus allowing learners to apply key topics more specifically to the appropriate grade level.

During interviews with administration and faculty in Phoenix an elaborate course and program development process was discussed. Additional documentation of the course and program development process was requested by the review team. Documentation of this process was validated during interviews with coursework development faculty in Minneapolis. A "Visual Description of Course and Program Development at Capella University" was submitted to ADE on July 6, 2007 as an addendum. This document describes the means by which ideas for new courses and programs find their way into Capella University's online course rooms and how they are systematically monitored and improved to assure to the greatest extent possible a consistent, standards based experience for all learners. A flow chart clearly defines the three (3) phases of this process (Concept Stage, Design Stage, and Development and Implementation Stage). The addendum is located in Section III page 13 of the addendum.

Given that each course is only ten weeks in length, the team questions whether students have adequate time to explore such a wide range of competencies identified in each course.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (1): Provide the Department with a description of the program being considered for Board approval. This shall include, at a minimum, the criteria for student entry into the program, a summary of the program course sequence, descriptions of all required courses, and verification that the program requires courses that are necessary to obtain a full Structured English Immersion endorsement.

Recommendation(s):

Focus more on the competencies that directly reflect ISLLC Standards. While indirect competencies are important, the benchmark assignments need to be correlated to the ISLLC standards.

Focus needs to be placed on measurable competencies not dispositions.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Documents
- Interviews in Phoenix and Minneapolis
- Addendum submitted July 6, 2007

If Unmet, further action required:

BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each course

Met ☐ Unmet ☒ (See comment below regarding Transition.)

Align with evidence on program matrix

Met ☐ Unmet ☒ (See comment below regarding Transition.)

Findings of the Team:

The evidence presented on signature assignments (i.e. artifacts or portfolio) is not readily evident or consistent between the program review matrix, course syllabi and final projects.

There is a lack of correlation between reviewed signature assignments and the listed artifact/evidence on the program review matrix.

Members of the site team were shown examples of signature assignments on-line by Dr. Rogers, Dr. Benson, and Ms. Gable during the Phoenix site visit. This documentation was provided in a hard copy to ADE on July 6, 2007. While Dr. Benson and Ms. Gable easily identified the assignments they considered to be the benchmark/signature assignments, the review team would like to see them clearly identified as such in each course syllabi. It is unclear whether every faculty member has the same understanding of "benchmark/signature assignments" as opposed to anchor papers. Based on receipt of the addendum, the identification of benchmark/signature assignments and communication of these identified assignments to faculty appears to be in transition.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

R7-2-604.01 (C) (3): Provide the Department with a description of the assessment plan for measuring competencies in coursework and field experience. The plan shall require, at a minimum, that **candidates demonstrate competencies as articulated in R7-2-602 and R7-2-603 and relevant national standards. This plan shall also describe processes for utilizing performance-based assessments** and for providing candidates with necessary remediation.

R7-2-604.01 (C) (5): Provide the Department with a program matrix that demonstrates that **program coursework assessments**, field experiences and capstone experiences align with relevant standards as articulated in R7-2-602 or R7-2-603 and with applicable national standards.

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program documents
- Interviews with learners and faculty during the Phoenix site visit
- On-line demonstration by Dr. Rogers and Ms. Gable during the Phoenix site visit
- Addendum submitted July 6, 2007

If Unmet, further action required:

Clearly identify through common language the benchmark assignments in each course syllabi, aligned with the program matrix.

RUBRICS FOR BENCHMARK/SIGNATURE ASSIGNMENTS

Clearly identified for each benchmark/signature assignment Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Clearly identified criteria Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

Performance indicators are not clearly written on all rubrics. They sometimes lack specificity and do not provide the learner with appropriate or meaningful feedback.

In some cases, there appeared to be a weakness in rubric design; unclear what is being assessed given that all criteria are equal in point value including content and mechanics.

The intent and outcomes of some assessment tools are unclear and lack substantive value or validity.

While some standardization is evident, the rubrics for the program use “teacher inquiry” language.

For the portfolio review rubric the rating scale is more ambiguous than a Likert scale; rubric provides no evidence to support “yes” or “no” indicators. For example, portfolios submitted for review presented internship log documentation and reflection that was not congruent with directions listed in ED5900 (see U03d2). Lack of critical reflection and insights. Listed self-reflections were more observations, actions or comments unrelated to a true self reflection.

Some portfolios have demonstrated a solid basis in artifact collection; however, the reflections or responses to coursework assignments show limited depth, critical thinking and analysis.

In multiple instructor final assessments, it was noted that general, broad statements were given to the learners without citation of specifics-both positive and negative feedback comments.

It was noted, in reviewed instructor feedback documents, a lack of expected rigor, it appears that the grades don’t reflect the true measure of quality and substance. Students received passing grades for substandard work. For example:

- ED5007—rubric for action research 18 points total, but 9 points out of 18 equals 80%.
- ED823 student earned 70%. Instructor comments included: failed to submit on time, assignment directions not followed.

Instructor feedback was often highly subjective and occasionally repetitive across student feedback comments.

Capella administration and faculty understood the review team’s concern for consistent application of rubrics in evaluating

benchmark/signature assignments and submitted a Plan for Faculty Development Opportunities Relative to the Consistent Application of Benchmark Assignment Rubrics as part of the requested addendum. This document may be located in Section II, page 9 of the addendum.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop standard rubrics for similar types of assignments using same/similar criteria and evaluation scales.

Training on writing rubrics and inter-rater reliability.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Documents
- Interviews in Phoenix and Minneapolis
- Student work samples

If Unmet, further action required:

Strengthen and standardize rubrics to provide measurable and meaningful outcomes.

FIELD EXPERIENCE(S)

Meets field experience definition ("scheduled, directed experiences in a pre-K – grade 12 setting that occurs prior to the capstone experience")
ARS R7-2-604

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Requirements are clearly identified (embedded or stand-alone)

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Alignment between course description, topics/objectives, competencies, benchmark assignments for coursework and field experiences and rubrics for coursework and field experiences

Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

The high quality of the internship experience was evident in interviews with faculty, learners, and alumni.

Field experiences are closely monitored; however, written guidelines for selection of site supervisors is minimal.

Assumptions are made regarding the experience of potential site supervisors in working with interns.

After discussions with faculty, it is evident that there is thoughtful deliberation on the interns' placement.

Guidelines for field work provide for attainment of learner competencies.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Develop written expectations for selection of site supervisors that adequately reflect Capella University expectations.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Documents
- Interviews with faculty and learners during Phoenix site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

EVALUATION INSTRUMENT(S) FOR FIELD EXPERIENCE

Evaluation instrument tied to state standards	Met <input type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable
Evaluation instrument tied to national standards	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	
Clearly identified criteria	Met <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unmet <input type="checkbox"/>	

Findings of the Team:

There is an adequate evaluation instrument for the field experience that is correlated to the ISLLC standards and does not focus solely on dispositions.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

While feedback given to interns is meaningful, it would be helpful to have a performance indicator scale instead of a Yes/No performance statement.

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Documents
- Interviews with learners and faculty during the Phoenix site visit

If Unmet, further action required:

PROGRAM MATRIX

Assessment of candidate's competency in meeting the standards aligned with coursework, field experiences, and assessments previously identified. Met ☐ Unmet ☒

Findings of the Team:

The evidence presented on signature assignments (i.e. artifacts or portfolio) is not readily evident or consistent between the Program Matrix, course syllabi and benchmark/signature assignments (final projects) .

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Matrix
- Step 2 program documents

If Unmet, further action required:

Submit revised Program Matrix. See recommended program approval for timeline for resubmission.

ASSESSMENT DATA

Three years of data or Assessment Plan assessing candidate's competency in meeting state and national standards Met ☒ Unmet ☐

Findings of the Team:

A plan has been developed.

Citation(s) in State Board Rule (if applicable):

Recommendation(s):

Evidence used for decision:

- Program Documents
- Interviews

If Unmet, further action required:

See recommended program approval for timeline for submission of additional data.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

☒ **Two (2) Year Approval**

- **Meets** certification requirements defined in State Board rules
- **Lacks** core program components
- Matrix provides **insufficient evidence** of how standards are being addressed related to coursework, field work, and assessment to determine candidate competency in meeting the standards
- **Lacks** 3 years of data or assessment plan

To extend the valid program approval to five years, the institution must submit to the Arizona Department of Education no later than 90 days prior to the expiration of the program approval the following documents:

- Coursework sequence;
- Coursework syllabi that align with State and National Standards and Indicators;
- Coursework syllabi that identify benchmark assignments with corresponding rubrics for assessing candidate's competency
- Updated program matrix that provides evidence of how state and national standards are being addressed related to coursework, field experience and assessments to determine a candidate's competency in meeting the standards;
- One year of data related to candidates' competency in meeting the standards based on coursework, field experiences and assessment identified in the program matrix.